

Remarks

Status of the Application

Prior to entry of this amendment, claims 1-5, 7-9, 11, 13, 14, 17, 29 and 31-33 were pending. The Office Action mailed July 22, 2010 rejected claims 1-5, 7-9, 11, 13, 14, 17, 29, and 31-33 under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 2006/0182055 to Coffee et al. ("Coffee"), in view of US Patent No. 7119831 to Ohto et al. ("Ohto"), further in view of US Patent No. 6900762 to Andrews et al. ("Andrews").

This paper amends claims 1, 11, and 29. No claims have been added or canceled. Hence, after entry of this paper, claims 1-5, 7-9, 11, 13, 14, 17, 29 and 31-33 will stand pending for examination. Claims 1, 11, and 29 are independent claims.

Claim Amendments

Claim 1 has been amended to recite "a plurality of cabinets of telecommunications plant equipment." Claim 1 has also been amended to more clearly indicate that the first location sensor is a "Global Positioning System (GPS) location sensor located within the cabinet." Claims 11 and 29 have been amended in similar fashion. Support for these amendments can be found throughout the application including, inter alia, in paragraph 0054.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-5, 7-9, 11, 13, 14, 17, 29, and 31-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coffee, in view of Ohto, further in view of Andrews.

These rejections are respectfully traversed, because the final Office Action has not demonstrated that the cited combination either teaches or suggests each element of any rejected claim.

Consider, for example, claim 1, which recites, inter alia, "a plurality of cabinets of telecommunications plant equipment." Claim 1 further recites, "a first Global Positioning System ('GPS') location sensor located within the cabinet and configured to provide a first location associated with the telecommunications plant equipment." None of the cited references discloses, or even suggests, this feature.

In rejecting claim 1, the office action argues that paragraphs 0289 and 0568 of Coffee disclose "telecommunications plant equipment" that is part of a network. Those paragraphs, however, fail to disclose the recited "plurality of cabinets of telecommunications plant equipment." Paragraph 0289 discloses "job sites" that relate to landscaping and construction. Paragraph 0568 discloses a "Dispatching Function subsystem" that "enables the user to schedule vehicles, assign resources, perform route optimization and work order status updates." Neither of these passages even approaches suggesting a plurality of cabinets of telecommunications plant equipment. Nor does anything in Ohto or Andrews appear to disclose, or even suggest, such features. For at least this reason, claim 1 is allowable over the cited references.

Additionally, however, the "first Global Positioning System ('GPS') location sensor located within the cabinet and configured to provide a first location associated with the telecommunications plant equipment," recited by claim 1, also fails to find any disclosure in either Coffee, Ohto or Andrews. The Office Action contends that figures 3 and 13, and column 10, line 62 – column 11 line 8 of Ohto discloses a first location sensor. The Office Action also alleges that column 6, lines 30-52 of Andrews discloses this feature.

Neither of these references, however, discloses any type of location sensor, let alone a GPS-based location sensor, within a cabinet of telecommunications plant equipment. (Indeed, as neither of the references even discloses such a cabinet, it would be impossible for them to disclose a location sensor disclosed within such a cabinet). The referenced portion of Ohto discloses the use of a portable location sensor in a camera. In fact, the entirety of Ohto appears not to disclose the installation of the GPS-based location sensor in any fixed location.

While Andrews does disclose a GPS-based location sensor, Andrews specifically teaches that the location sensor is disposed at the top of a building, for optimal GPS signal reception. Andrews, therefore teaches away from the recited element.

Accordingly, for at least this additional reason, claim 1 is allowable over the cited combination. Claims 11 and 29, which recite similar elements, are allowable for at least similar reasons. The remaining claims all depend from either claim 1, claim 11, or claim 29, and those dependent claims are allowable at least by virtue of their dependence.

Conclusion

Applicant believes that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. If it would be helpful to obtain favorable consideration of this case, the Examiner is encouraged to call and discuss this case with the undersigned.

This paper constitutes a request for any needed extension of time and an authorization to charge all fees therefore to deposit account No. 19-5117, if not otherwise specifically requested. The undersigned hereby authorizes the charge of any fees created by the filing of this document or any deficiency of fees submitted herewith to be charged to deposit account No. 19-5117.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 2010-10-21

/Chad E. King/
Chad E. King, #44,187
Swanson & Bratschun, L.L.C.
8210 Southpark Terrace
Littleton, CO 80120
Telephone: (303) 268-0066
Facsimile: (303) 268-0065

S:\Client\Folders\0438 (Qwest)\092600US\020366-092600US Response to Final Office Action 072210.doc